



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,089	02/08/2002	Gaurav Bhatia	OR01-15801	9443

51067 7590 12/27/2005

ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
c/o A. RICHARD PARK
2820 FIFTH STREET
DAVIS, CA 95616-2914

EXAMINER

FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/072,089

Applicant(s)

BHATIA ET AL.

Examiner

Courtney D. Fields

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending.
2. Claims 1,4,9,12,17, and 20 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, in view of Graham-Cumming, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,146).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. (Pub No. 2003/0012382) in view of Graham-Cumming, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,146).

Referring to the rejection of claims 1,9, and 17, Ferchichi et al. discloses a single-sign on process comprising:

receiving an access request from a user at an application in the distributed computing environment (See page 2, Section 0053)

determining if the distributed computing environment has issued an authentication to a user device through which the user accesses the application,

wherein the authentication is stored within a time-stamped token on the user device, and wherein the authentication has not expired (See page 3, Section 0087, page 4, Section 0090)

and if the authentication has not been received or has expired, redirecting the access request to a single sign-on server for the distributed computing environment, otherwise granting access to the application to the user (See page 8, Section 0162).

However, Ferchichi et al. does not explicitly disclose determining if the authentication has not expired by comparing a time within the time-stamped token against a current time.

Graham-Cumming, Jr. discloses a method, computer-readable media, and apparatus to facilitate global timeout in a distributed computing environment comprising: determining if the authentication has not expired by comparing a time within the time-stamped token against a current time (See Column 7, lines 60-67, Column 8, lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to improve a single-sign on process by implementing a time-out mechanism. By combining the teachings of Ferchichi et al. and Graham-Cumming, Jr., one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since, a need exists for detecting the optimization of data within a network (See Column 3, lines 65-67, Column 4, lines 1-14).

Referring to the rejection of claims 2,10, and 18, (Ferchichi et al. as modified by Graham-Cumming, Jr.) discloses the claimed limitation wherein the distributed computing environment includes multiple partner applications distributed across multiple

network server coupled to a public network (See Ferchichi et al., page 5, Section 0106, page 6, Section 0116-0120)

Referring to the rejection of claims 3,11, and 19, (Ferchichi et al. as modified by Graham-Cumming, Jr.) discloses the claimed limitation wherein the public network includes the Internet (See Ferchichi et al., page 6, Section 0120)

Referring to the rejection of claims 4,12, and 20, (Ferchichi et al. as modified by Graham-Cumming, Jr.) discloses the claimed limitation wherein determining if the distributed computing environment has issued the authentication to the user involves:

- receiving an authentication credential from the user,
- verifying that the authentication credential is valid,
- and providing the time-stamped token to the user-device, wherein the time-stamped token includes the authentication and a time (See Ferchichi et al., page 5, Sections 0108-0114, page 6, Section 0115)

Referring to the rejection of claims 5,13, and 21, (Ferchichi et al. as modified by Graham-Cumming, Jr.) discloses the claimed limitation wherein determining if the authentication has expired involves:

- recovering the time-stamped token from the user device,
- adding the specified period to the time within the time-stamped token to produce an expiry time,
- and detecting if a current time is later than the expiry time, whereby if the current time is later than the expiry time, the authentication has expired (See Ferchichi et al., page 10, Sections 0208-0211, 0213, and 0215)

Referring to the rejection of claims 6, 14, and 22, (Ferchichi et al. as modified by Graham-Cumming, Jr.) discloses the claimed limitation wherein the time-stamped token is updated to the current time by a partner application when the partner application is accessed (See Ferchichi et al., page 10, Section 0213)

Referring to the rejection of claims 7, 15, and 23, (Ferchichi et al. as modified by Graham-Cumming, Jr.) discloses the claimed limitation wherein the time-stamped token is a domain cookie, wherein the domain cookie is accessible by multiple network servers within a domain on a public network (See Ferchichi et al., page 9, Section 0199)

Referring to the rejection of claims 8, 16, and 24, (Ferchichi et al. as modified by Graham-Cumming, Jr.) discloses the claimed limitation wherein the time-stamped token is encrypted to prevent attacks (See Ferchichi et al., page 11, Section 0217)

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2137

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


cdf

December 22, 2005


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER